Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security

Institut canadien pour la paix et la sécurité internationales

WORKING PAPER #17

CHALLENGES TO CANADIAN SECURITY IN THE YEAR 2000: A SUMMARY OF CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

By Jean-François Rioux

Winnipeg, 3-5 November 1988

April 1989

WORKING PAPER #17

CHALLENGES TO CANADIAN SECURITY IN THE YEAR 2000: A SUMMARY OF CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

By Jean-François Rioux

Winnipeg, 3-5 November 1988

April 1989

89-05319/

360 Albert Street, Suite 900
Ottawa, Ontario
K1R 7X7

ISBN 0-662-17024-5

PREFACE

The Act of Parliament which created the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security in August 1984 stipulated that:

> "The purpose of the Institute is to increase knowledge and understanding of the issues relating to international peace and security from a Canadian perspective, with particular emphasis on arms control, disarmament, defence and conflict resolution, and to
>
> a) foster, fund and conduct research on matters relating to international peace and security;
>
> b) promote scholarship in matters relating to international peace and security;
>
> c) study and propose ideas and policies for the enhancement of international peace and security; and,
>
> d) collect and disseminate information on, and encourage public discussion of issues of international peace and security."

In order to meet some of these objective, the Institute has organized a series of annual conferences.

When he launched the International Year of Peace, on 1 January 1986, Javier Pérez de Cuéllar, Secretary-General of the United Nations stated, in part, that: "Humanity stands today at a crossroad. The path of the future remains open, subject to a choice which has yet to be made. One road leads to peace, the other to self-destruction. As military expenditures continue to rise and ever more sophisticated weapons and technology are developed, the threat of nuclear annihilation has reached a critical juncture. This is not, however, the only challenge of our time. The world today must also confront the hardships caused by regional and local conflicts, the debilitating effects of disease and poverty, the misery of famine and natural disaster. It is time to act on behalf of the future well-being of all nations with the vision and forbearance that peace requires."

In this spirit the CIIPS Conference which was held at the Delta Winnipeg on 3 to 5 November 1988, addressed "Challenges to Canadian Security in the Year 2000."

Jean-François Rioux is a doctoral candidate in political science at Carleton University. He teaches at the University of Ottawa.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

CONFERENCE PROGRAMME 1

INTRODUCTION 5

I GLOBAL CHALLENGES IN THE YEAR 2000 9

Keynote Speech by Stephen Lewis

II ECONOMIC SECURITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT 13

1. Poverty and Population 13
Digby McLaren
John Loxley

2. Environmental Change 16
Francine Fournier
Jim MacNeil

3. Workshop on Poverty and Economics 19

4. Workshop on Global Environmental Issues 20

5. Poverty and the Environment--Canadian responses 22
David Braide
Douglas Lindores

III DIPLOMATIC AND MILITARY SECURITY 27

1. Prospects for Nuclear Disarmament 27
Harriet Critchley
Richard Ned Lebow

2. Control of Regional Conflict 31
Liisa North
Jean-Pierre Derriennic

3. Workshop on Conflict and Arms 34

4. War and Peace--Canadian responses 35
Ron Fisher
Geoffrey Pearson

IV PARTICIPANTS AND SPEAKERS 41

PROGRAMME

GLOBAL CHALLENGES TO CANADIAN SECURITY IN THE YEAR 2000

Thursday, 3 November (Delta Ballroom)

19:30 **Dinner - Global Challenges in the Year 2000**
20:30 Introduction: The Right Honourable Edward Schreyer

Keynote Speaker: Stephen Lewis
former Canadian Ambassador
to the United Nations

Friday, 4 November (Delta Ballroom)

09:00 **Welcoming Remarks:**
William Barton
Chairman
Canadian Institute for International
Peace and Security

09:20 **Poverty/Population**
Chair: Digby McLaren
President
Royal Society of Canada

Speaker: John Loxley
Professor and Head of Economics Department
University of Manitoba

10:30 **Coffee Break**

11:00 **Environmental Change**
Chair: Francine Fournier
Secretary-General
Canadian Commission for UNESCO

Speaker: Jim MacNeill
Director, Environment & Sustainable
Development Program
Institute for Research on Public Policy,
Ottawa

12:00 **Lunch**

Friday, 4 November (Delta Ballroom - cont'd)

14:00 **Prospects for Nuclear Disarmament**
Chair: Harriet Critchley
Director, Strategic Studies Program
University of Calgary

Speaker: Richard Ned Lebow
Director
Peace Studies Program
Cornell University

15:30 **Coffee Break**

16:00 **Control of Regional Conflict**
Chair: Liisa North
Professor, Department of Political Science
York University

Speaker: Jean-Pierre Derriennic
Professeur, Département de Science politique
Université Laval

20:00 to 22:00 **Workshops**
A. Conflict and Arms (Prairie Room)
Chair: Kal Holsti
Professor, Department of Political Sciences
University of British Columbia

B. Poverty and Economics (Portage Room)
Chair: Marie-Andrée Lalonde-Morisset
Senior Grants Officer
Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security

C. Global Environmental Issues (Manitoba East)
Chair: Jean-Guy Vaillancourt
Professeur, Département de sociologie
Université de Montréal

Saturday, 5 November (Delta Ballroom)

Canadian Responses

08:30 **Workshops Reports**
Chair: Marie-Andrée Lalonde Morisset
Senior Grants Officer
Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security

Saturday, 5 November (Delta Ballroom - cont'd)

09:30 **War and Peace**
Chair: Ron Fisher
Professor, Department of Psychology
University of Saskatchewan

Speaker: Geoffrey Pearson
Executive Director
Canadian Institute for International
Peace and Security

10:30 **Coffee Break**

11:00 **Poverty and the Environment**
Chair: David Braide
Deputy Chairman
The Niagara Institute

Speaker: Douglas Lindores
Senior Vice-President
Canadian International Development Agency

12:30 **Closing Remarks**
Geoffrey Pearson
Canadian Institute for International
Peace and Security

INTRODUCTION

Unlike most traditional conferences on security, the 1988 Annual Conference of the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security did not set out to identify Canada's friends and enemies, nor did it seek to list the military threats facing Canada and its allies or discuss the best methods of protecting ourselves against these.

The conference was concerned, rather, with Canadian security in all its aspects, and the security of all those living in Canada, instead of that of the state as such. Moreover, security was not dealt with simply from a political or military point of view. The conference emphasized the pressing need for efforts to protect Canadians against the many threats to their physical well-being, their liberty, their happiness and their health. In addition, the conference saw the security of Canadians as being inextricably bound up with that of the rest of the world; such dangers as the nuclear arms race, regional conflict, Third World poverty and the deterioration of the environment threaten the welfare of every single human being. These are the challenges of the 21st century.

This concept of global security is summed up very well in a passage from the Brandt Commission Report of 1980:

> An important task of constructive international policy will have to consist in providing a new, more comprehensive understanding of "security" which would be less restricted to the purely military aspects. In the global context true security cannot be achieved by a mounting build-up of weapons--defence in the narrow sense--but only by providing basic conditions for peaceful relations between nations, and solving not only the military but also the non-military problems which threaten them.

Both the 1982 Palme Report on disarmament and the 1987 Brundtland Report on the environment also envisage security as requiring a multilateral process for solving global problems through the auspices of the United Nations.

Unfortunately, until recently the international situation was so bad that those, in Canada or elsewhere, who accepted this global concept of security were voices crying in the wilderness. Relations between the United States and the Soviet Unions were at their worst and this led to cynicism and a sense of fatalism. In addition, the economic crisis had made the West indifferent to Third World poverty and there was a general return to individualism. In the early 80s the West was mainly concerned with maintaining a

strategic balance with the Soviet Union and with its own economic prospects--little attention was paid to other international issues. However, as several speakers such as Ron Fisher, Stephen Lewis and Ed Schreyer pointed out, Pierre Trudeau's peace initiative and the consequent founding of the Institute were points of light in an otherwise dark period, as were the reports referred to above.

The current international situation is more conducive to a global view of security. As Stephen Lewis reminded the conference in his opening address, the advent of Gorbachev as leader of the Soviet Union has brought about a remarkable transformation of that country's policy. This has made it possible to achieve progress in such matters as disarmament, containing conflict and strengthening the United Nations. He pointed out that there are other positive aspects of the situation as well. The new period of detente between the superpowers has drawn attention to the need for security in the Third World and has inspired a desire to deal with the problems involved. The issue of Third World debt, which came to a head in 1982 and has remained without solution ever since, is now attracting widespread attention in the West; various governments, political parties and NGOs are becoming more and more concerned with this; the plight of Africa, faced with famine and sickness has begun to trouble the conscience of the West. But above all the deterioration of the environment has been brought to everyone's attention by various alarming studies concerning changes in the atmosphere and by the discovery of a hole in the ozone layer over Antarctica.

The time was ripe, therefore, for the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security to attempt to provide a global view of Canadian security. The 1988 conference was an opportunity to study the various challenges Canada faces in this area; it also provided a platform where participants could express their views about the concrete options available to Canada and to the international community in attempting to deal with the major economic, ecological and military problems which confront humanity at the end of the twentieth century.

The conference did not set out, however, to unveil any miracle solutions or to enunciate a political programme which would solve the world's problems once and for all. As Geoffrey Pearson, the Executive Director of CIIPS at that time, pointed out, the Institute's mandate, is simply to support the general principles of international peace and

security. The purpose of the conference was to make people aware of the situation and of what was at stake, rather than to provide a detailed programme of action.

The conference discussed traditional aspects of security--diplomacy, regional conflict, disarmament and similar matters; development issues--poverty and population growth; and ecological matters--such as the degradation of the environment and eco-development. It would be difficult, however, to describe each presentation as falling under one or the other of these specific headings, since the subjects under discussion are so closely related. Despite this the following report is subdivided by theme in order to make it easier to read. The subject matter has been grouped under two major headings, diplomatic and military security on the one hand, and economic and environmental security on the other.

This distinction is not intended to create a false dichotomy between political issues and "the rest", but it seems unavoidable because the participants treated developmental and environmental issues as inextricably entangled.

I GLOBAL CHALLENGES IN THE YEAR 2000

Keynote Speech by Stephen Lewis

Stephen Lewis began by drawing attention to three important positive developments which are likely to affect the international situation in the years ahead. The first of these is the change which has come over the United Nations--this was symbolized by the awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize to the UN Peacekeeping Forces. There is hope now that the UN might resume its original role as the guardian of international peace and security. Mr. Lewis recalled the oppressive atmosphere which prevailed at the UN when he first went there in 1984 and he suggested that future historians would be amazed at how quickly it had changed. The second important development, according to Mr. Lewis, has been Mr. Gorbachev's leadership of the Soviet Union. This is turning out to be a remarkable performance. Not only has the Soviet Union been adopting a constructive attitude toward the United Nations since 1986, but its attempts at agricultural reform and at increasing its trade with the West, as well as the withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan, augur well for the future. Finally, Mr. Lewis believes that recent developments in the disarmament process (such as the INF agreement and the resumption of negotiations on chemical, conventional and strategic weapons) are another encouraging sign.

Nevertheless, Mr. Lewis said, despite these hopeful developments we must not ignore the serious threats to our security which we will have to deal with in what remains of this century. Problems of poverty and under-development were far from being solved and it seemed likely that the next US president would be George Bush (he was in fact elected three days later) who would pay no more attention to these issues than did his predecessor. To make matters worse, Third World poverty was increasing rapidly: for example, if one excluded India and China, the amount spent by most of the poorer countries on health and education fell by forty percent from 1972 to 1987.

Mr. Lewis used the situation in Africa to illustrate the severity of the problem. If the debt continues to increase and there is no change in the amount devoted to development assistance, by the year 2000 the billion people living in Africa will have a lower standard of living than they do at present. The African countries' annual interest payments on the debt have risen from US $3 to 5 billion between 1980 and 1983 to US $25 billion in 1989. By 1995 this figure could be as high as $45 billion. One realizes

just how shocking the problem is when it is pointed out that in 1986 and 1987 the money these countries needed to service their debt was a billion dollars more than the amount they received from the International Monetary Fund. Moreover, the austerity programmes imposed on the debtor countries solve nothing, they only put a brake on human and economic development. If one takes into account the lower commodity prices on the world market and the fall in Africa's export revenues in recent years, it is clear that the debt problem will not solve itself. Moreover the development of various substitute products might make the situation even more difficult for Third World exporters. Stephen Lewis criticized the Group of Seven for having failed to take any positive action to alleviate this problem. He said that the US $100 billion owed to the West by the twenty-two poorest countries could be written off without making any significant difference to the lending countries.

Mr. Lewis deplored the fact that the great majority of Western countries have not yet accepted the recommendations of the Pearson Report, which--twenty years earlier--urged donor countries to devote 0.7 percent of their Gross National Product to development assistance. Indeed, the United States has even reduced its aid to Africa south of the Sahara; in 1985 this had amounted to US $1.3 billion, while in the current year it had fallen to US $600 million. Canada and the West must make every effort to prevent Africa sinking to levels of even greater misery in the 21st century.

Protecting the environment is the other great challenge which faces humanity and there are two aspects to this: on the one hand pollution must be reduced in the industrialized countries, and on the other, the poorer ones must be able to develop their economies without damaging the ecological balance. Mr. Lewis praised the work done by the United Nations which has resulted in the Brundtland Report on Development and the Environment.

This report accepts two main principles--the need for sustainable development and the acceptance of earth, sea and air as our common inheritance. It provides the necessary basis for a worldwide policy on the environment.

The third objective of any global policy designed to promote peace and security must be to link disarmament with development. Mr. Lewis reminded his audience that if both North and South were to reduce what they spend on arms, enormous resources

would be released which could then be devoted to international development. He regretted that this option has been rejected not only by various industrialized states, not willing either to disarm or to increase their contribution to development, but also by Third World governments unwilling to admit publicly that they spend more on their armies than on education or health. Nevertheless this matter was discussed in 1987 at a special conference of the United Nations, which was attended by all major countries, with the exception of the United States.

Illiteracy is a fourth problem confronting the world. The United Nations Development Programme estimated that by the year 2000 there will be more than a billion illiterate people. How will these people be able to find jobs in the age of computers? It is important to note that women will be the main losers in this situation.

Finally, human rights present a great challenge as we prepare to enter the 21st century. There are more than sixty international legal instruments concerning human rights, including the two main UN covenants and the optional protocol; yet these are rarely used. Canada must persist with its efforts in this area, in particular to bring about a covenant concerning the rights of native peoples, and it should ratify the convention on the rights of children and encourage more widespread application of the convention on the rights of women.

Mr. Lewis ended his speech by proposing that the United Nations would be the most suitable vehicle for promoting the new interpretation of international peace and security which is so urgently needed. This concept would emphasize development and the environment and would attach great importance to human rights. He also suggested certain traditional ways in which the United Nations could play a more active role: it could establish a permanent peacekeeping force which could be easily deployed when needed; it could reinforce the role of the International Court of Justice; it could create new methods of dealing with regional conflict. Finally, the former ambassador warned his audience against giving way to pessimism and he urged that international affairs be given a new dimension by being directed to the interests of humanity as a whole.

II ECONOMIC SECURITY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

1. Poverty and Population

Digby McLaren introduced the speaker by emphasizing the effects of the population explosion on the ecology. He pointed out that the environment is currently affected far more by human activities than by natural forces. For example, man displaces more matter and produces more change in the atmosphere than do volcanoes. According to Mr. McLaren, the current vagaries in the climate are probably caused by human activities and are indicative of much more serious environmental problems. The population explosion presents the greatest threat to ecology and the planet cannot survive the depletion of its resources and the deterioration of the environment which this rapid increase in population entails. Mr. McLaren ended his speech with a striking image: he said that if intelligent extra-terrestrial beings were to approach the planet earth they would immediately identify it as a system out of control.

John Loxley tried to show how difficult it would be to reduce population growth with the programmes currently underway. He suggested that the growth rate can be reduced only is we adopt a policy for international development which included certain new social measures.

According to the conventional analysis of the connection between population and poverty, demographic growth is one of the main causes of Third World poverty, since the increase in the number of mouths to be fed cannot be offset by a corresponding rise in agricultural productivity. This thesis was first propounded by the British economist Thomas Malthus (1766-1834) and certain current developments would seem to confirm his apocalyptic vision of demography.

In 1500 the total world population numbered about 600 million. This doubled in three hundred and fifty years, by 1850. During the next hundred years it doubled again and then again, in only 35 years, by 1985. The main factor in this rapid growth has been fertility in the Third World. In the 1960s, Paul Erlich predicted in The Population Bomb that the world's population would number 10 billion by the year 2000. It is now known that this figure will not be reached before the end of the 21st century, since the birthrate of two percent of twenty years ago has now fallen to between 1.6 and 1.7

percent, largely as a result of the rigorous birth control policy applied in China. However, the situation is different elsewhere in the Third World. In Africa the birthrate is higher than it has ever been and is double that of Europe in the nineteenth century. This means that the population of Africa could double in the next twenty years.

According to Professor Loxley, the population explosion is putting great pressure on the earth and its food resources. The situation in Africa is indeed reminiscent of Malthus. In the 1960s, population grew by 2.6 percent annually, whereas agricultural productivity only increased by 2.1 percent. The current figures are 2.9 percent and 1.7 percent respectively and as a result of this, thirty-four African countries are threatened by famine. Social and educational programmes are overwhelmed by this problem and it is women who suffer most from a lack of services. Unemployment or underemployment affects the majority of the population. The growth of the cities has been chaotic and deforestation and the erosion and impoverishment of the soil are threatening the environment. Finally, the disparity between the rich and the poor is constantly increasing.

Mr. Loxley warned his audience, however, against accepting the Malthusian explanation of population growth. It is, he said, poverty which leads to over-population rather than the reverse. It is natural for couples in the Third World to have large families since it is their children who will support them in their old age. In addition, population growth is closely related to cultural patterns; it is the reflection of a division of labour which limits women to having babies. Mr. Loxley also pointed out that the widespread inequality in the Third World is a further cause of poverty and social backwardness. History shows that a reduction in the birthrate normally follows improvements in economic security, a better standard of living and the emancipation of women.

Given the situation in the Third World, therefore, the current birth control programmes supported by the development agencies are unlikely to prove effective. A reduction in the rate of population growth will depend upon greater social equality (brought about by agrarian reform), improved economic security (through attaining self-sufficiency in agriculture) and a better lot for women (through such measures as an increase in literacy).

In order to realize these conditions Mr. Loxley thought it essential that the problem of Third World debt be treated as a matter of urgency. Although some steps have been taken in this direction--Canada has forgiven the poorest African countries part of the official debt--there is still a long way to go. The developing countries are exhausting their resources with heavy interest payments even though the banks in the industrialized world know full well that most of the debt will never be repaid and that their reserves, which have been refurbished thanks to the tax payers, are quite adequate to allow much of the debt to be annulled.

Professor Loxley then turned his attention to the situation in Canada and pointed out that here, too, a link between demography and poverty is forming as the population grows older. At present, people over sixty-five account for a third of the poor in Canada. By the year 2000, this group could amount to fifteen percent of the entire Canadian population and there is a considerable risk that this will produce a corresponding increase in the number of poor people. Despite the attention paid to the affluent Yuppies (young urban professionals) and the soaring prices of real estate in our big cities, there is nonetheless a great deal of inequality in our society. At the top of the heap, ten percent of the Canadian population possess thirty percent of the wealth, while at the bottom, thirty percent have to make do with ten percent of the total wealth. We will have to make a lot of progress, therefore, to ensure that the increasing number of old people do not become a poverty-stricken group in a society dominated by a small economic elite.

Canadian immigration policy constitutes a link between demography here and in the Third World. By this, Professor Loxley does not mean that overpopulation in the Third World could be solved by having people immigrate to Canada, rather that increased immigration is necessary for the future wellbeing of our country. He is strongly opposed to simplistic theories which view immigration as a threat to the economy and does not believe that it should be tied to the level of employment in Canada. Immigrants stimulate economic activity and an increase in immigration, particularly if it favours young families, would provide economic impetus and help balance our aging population.

In conclusion, Professor Loxley maintained that if the West wants to sustain international development and protect the environment, it cannot maintain its present high rate of growth or its luxurious style of life. We will have to accept that our way

of life cannot be exported, that it is not conducive to Third World development and that it is depleting our natural resources. We must take a serious look at our values and settle for a more modest way of life.

During the subsequent discussion Professor Loxley declared that the natural forces which have limited population growth in the past--famine, war and epidemics--are no longer effective in this respect but simply lead to additional suffering for the world's poor. He denied any suggestion that he supports increased immigration only for economic reasons, humanitarian motives for admitting immigrants are entirely laudable but he wanted to repudiate the argument that immigration might endanger our standard of living.

2. Environmental Change

Francine Fournier spoke of the importance of ecological issues in international affairs, citing recent studies by UNESCO which show that the three great challenges facing us in the remaining years of the century are peace, development and the environment. The Brundtland report has provided a channel for widespread concern about the environment and its authors have given an excellent account of ways in which security might well be affected by the state of the environment. The report points out that when resources are scarce, states as well as institutions are more likely to resort to armed conflict in order to obtain control of these resources. Madame Fournier also emphasized the specific way in which armed conflict contributes to the deterioration of the environment and described how the armaments industry has been responsible for further depletion of scarce resources. Under the leadership of its new director general, Federico Mayor, UNESCO is placing great emphasis on ecology; Mr. Mayor has spoken of the need to pay attention to ecological concerns in promoting peace and development and has praised the concept of sustainable development which has been formulated in the Brundtland report.

Jim MacNeill said that Canadians now saw the destruction of the environment as being as great a threat to the planet as the risk of nuclear war. Despite the growing interest in ecological issues, as shown by the success of the Brundtland report, our ideas about security and our political and economic institutions are out of date and not suitable for coping with this urgent problem.

Mr. MacNeill began by discussing the deterioration of the atmosphere emphasizing the seriousness of the crisis. The ozone layer which protects the earth against ultra-violet radiation has been depleted by more than three percent during the last decade as a result of the destructive effect of the chlorofluorocarbons, which also contributes to the greenhouse effect and to the warming of the planet. This latter phenomenon is particularly alarming for certain low-lying coastal countries. The Maldives, for example, where the highest point is only two metres above sea level, would be almost totally engulfed if various scientific predictions turn out to be true and the level of the ocean rises by 1.5 metres in the next forty to sixty years as a result of rising temperatures. Will we have to add the names of some countries to our list of "threatened species"?

The final communiqué of the World Conference on the Changing Atmosphere: Implications for Global Security, which took place in Toronto in June 1988 clearly links changes in the atmosphere with international security. The communiqué described how disastrous changes in the environment would lead to "potentially severe economic and social dislocation ... which would worsen international tensions and increase risk of conflicts between and within nations." It said that such change "may well become the major non-military threat to international security and the future of the global economy."

Continuing with this line of argument, Mr. MacNeill maintained that even if political and economic considerations often give rise to destructive development policies and environmental stress, it is more and more often these latter factors which lead to international conflict. The connection is extremely complex, however, and differs from one situation to another. Mr. MacNeill used those he described as "environmental refugees" to illustrate his point. From 1984 to 1985 there were ten million refugees in Africa alone--two-thirds of the world's total. The immediate cause might seem to have been political conflict, but at a deeper level deforestation and drought were largely to blame. The problems which have arisen in such countries as Ethiopia, El Salvador or Haiti are largely due to the deterioration in the environment. The process of desertification is increasing dramatically in the Third World. In India, half the country was wooded only seventy-five years ago; now this is reduced to fourteen percent. In Ethiopia only one percent of the land is covered with trees, compared to thirty percent only forty years earlier. Not surprisingly, policies which encourage people to take over the forests and cut down the trees in order to increase agricultural production only

serve to hasten this process. Brazil is a particularly striking case in point. Reforestation programmes are quite unable to cope with this tendency. In the Third World the number of trees planted amount to only ten percent of those cut down and compensation programmes are quite inadequate. Even industrialized countries like Canada are not replanting a sufficient number of trees and are therefore in no position to preach about this to such countries as Indonesia and Brazil.

The situation concerning drinking water is almost as bad. Consumption of drinking water has also doubled since 1940 and certain rivers are likely to become sources of conflict between neighbouring states. The Nile and the Ganges are examples of this.

The warming of the atmosphere is irreversible. In Mr. MacNeill's opinion the best we can hope to do is slow this process down or possibly stabilize the situation in the long term, but only if governments take immediate action. A first step in this direction would be to ratify the Montreal Protocol which aimed at imposing a complete ban on the production of chlorofluorcarbons (CFCs) by the year 2000. This would reduce the warming process by fifteen percent. The participants in the Toronto Conference agreed that the industrialized world should aim to reduce, by the year 2005, carbon dioxide emissions from the combustion of fossil fuels to eighty percent of the 1988 level. Mr. MacNeill suggested that the oil industry and the hydro electric companies should be obliged to undertake reforestation programmes to make up for the adverse effects of their activities on the environment. An international fund for the atmosphere could be created, to be financed by a tax on the use of fossil fuels in industrialized countries. Above all, governments must stop subsidizing the use of fossil fuels and devote their energies to promoting other types of energy. The current situation, according to the speaker, is quite unprecedented and we must stop promoting economic growth without paying attention to the way this is depleting our natural resources. It is essential that from now on our economic policies respect the environment.

In order to ensure global security we must come to terms with the ecological problems. Jim MacNeill maintained that nations could protect their security much more effectively by spending money on the environment rather than buying costly military equipment. Every day the world spends US $2.7 billion on arms and many countries devote more to their defence budgets than to development, health, education and the environment combined. The amount needed to undertake serious programmes to counter-

act deforestation, desertification and population growth is less than the world spends on military defence in a single month. Canada is just like the others--it is considering the purchase of costly nuclear powered submarines to protect the Arctic when the real threat to that area is ecological rather than military. It would be much better to collaborate with other Polar countries in establishing a programme to protect the Arctic against the greenhouse effect and a rise in the level of the ocean.

In conclusion, Mr. MacNeill said that the effects of the warming of the earth will probably be felt in as little as eight years. In only forty years the average temperature might well have risen by 4.5 degrees Celsius and the level of the oceans by 1.5 metres. By then it might be too late. It is essential, therefore, that the public, both in Canada and in other industrialized countries, put pressure on their leaders to treat the protection of the natural environment as a governmental priority.

During the subsequent discussion a great deal of attention was paid to the question of replacing fossil fuels, and Mr. MacNeill reiterated his belief that it is essential to stop using these. Digby MacLaren agreed with him, pointing out that three- quarters of the energy we use comes from this source. He was particularly critical of the use of coal; although it is the most efficient source of energy it produces twice as much CO2 as oil or natural gas. Mr. MacNeill repeated his conviction that it would be realistic to try and reduce our consumption of motor fuels and that this reduction would have concrete economic advantages in the long run.

3. Workshop on Poverty and Economics

In this workshop the participants discussed two themes: poverty in Canada and poverty in the Third World. The main conclusion was that poverty and social injustice are major threats to world security.

Concern was expressed about the fact that the Canadian population is getting older. This fact, combined with inadequate social programmes, might well produce a society characterized by greater poverty and insecurity. Canadians are too deeply in debt and the financial institutions have too great an influence on their lives. It is important to attain full employment by promoting education, creating training programmes and encouraging professional retraining.

The participants expressed their regret that they, like Canadians in general, know so little about the problems of underdevelopment in the Third World and they stressed the need for the Canadian public to be made more aware of the issues involved.

The majority of participants thought the connection between economic and social injustice in the Third World and regional conflict to be self-evident. They agreed with Professor Loxley's analysis of the negative effect of the debt and recommended that priority should be given to attempts to deal with this problem. Canada should accept its share of responsibility for the debt and should embark on an economic programme to help the Third World. The participants recognized, however, that defence expenditure has a significant effect on the level of indebtedness and that the West is not solely responsible for this phenomenon. Attempts to promote international development must be accompanied by disarmament measures. The participants also stressed the need for reducing illiteracy and felt that aid programmes should be geared to improving agriculture and meeting human needs rather than to industrial development and megaprojects.

In conclusion the members of the workshop agreed that the government should make efforts to achieve full employment and maintain adequate social programmes to ensure the security of all Canadians in the year 2000. As far as the Third World was concerned Canada should help it to deal with its debt problem and should insist on aid policies which were designed to meet people's daily needs and to ensure a subsistence level.

4. Workshop on Global Environmental Issues

The participants began by accepting a global definition of security which included protection of the environment. With this is mind, priority should be given to reconciling the needs of both the economy and the ecology through a policy of sustainable development.

It was agreed that militarization has had a direct effect on both political conflicts and economic and ecological problems, and participants accepted the conclusions of the Palme Report concerning this. Disarmament must be tied to development and ecology. Professor Vaillancourt pointed out that for several years various groups in Quebec had taken as their slogan "Disarm to develop in a different way." The creation of an

international fund for development and the environment, to be financed by the money saved by reducing defence budgets, could do a great deal to make the world a better place to live in.

In order to maintain the ecological balance we must switch from being a society using fossil fuels to a conservationist society using other types of energy. Replacing coal, oil and gas would necessitate making difficult choices, however, since all the possible substitutes have disadvantages. Nuclear power does not produce CO2 but it involves other serious risks to the environment. Hydro electricity is a renewable, efficient and reliable source of energy but its creation might have adverse effects on the environment in the Canadian North and the Northern peoples' way of life. The use of hydrogen as a source of energy remains to be explored and solar or aeolian energy are expensive to produce and cannot be used on a large scale. There was only one point on which all were agreed: it is desirable to save energy and to use it efficiently and Canada has a long way to go in this respect.

There are a variety of practical measures which Canada should take, in the opinion of the participants. The quantity of garbage we produce should be reduced either by recycling and possibly also by imposing a special tax on excessive amounts. Agricultural land should be preserved by less intensive cultivation and less use of heavy machinery and chemicals. There should be an increased number of bicycle paths in our cities in order to popularize the bicycle as a means of transport.

The workshop noted that although the problems of deforestation and desertification are very serious in the Third World they are not irreversible--what people have done, they can also undo. The excessive use of chemicals in agriculture is also a problem in the Third World, as is over-mechanization which creates unemployment. The South must pursue a policy of eco-development.

The participants concluded by agreeing with Digby MacLaren and Jim MacNeill in their hope that and Canadians will change their attitude to ecology. One might expect governments to give the lead but, in fact, it is the electors who must put pressure on their legislators to introduce reforms to protect the environment.

5. Poverty and the Environment: Canadian Responses

David Braide expressed his delight at the fact that the conference had accepted such a broad definition of security. To him, the connection between environmental problems, poverty and insecurity is only too evident. However, he pointed out that efforts to protect the environment sometimes conflict with the legitimate aspirations of developing countries to increase their rate of economic growth.

Douglas Lindores spoke of Canadian efforts in the area of development and the environment. He began by saying that the view that all human problems are interdependent is the basic assumption taken by all aid and development programmes. Third World poverty will affect all of us in the long run, above all because peace is impossible in a world in which there is widespread misery. Poverty in the South has produced a large number of homeless, unemployed people who, when they join together in self defence, are often subject to brutal repression. This violence is endemic and often spills over into regional conflict. The ecological problems which are largely the product of the West's extravagant life style only serve to increase the conflicts in the Third World. Access to drinking water and to fertile soil is becoming increasingly difficult and this could lead to mass movements of refugees and even more conflict.

Speaking about Canadian development assistance as it affects poverty, Mr. Lindores said that it would be naive to imagine that we could solve the problem of poverty through Public Development Assistance (PDA) alone. The policy pursued by CIDA is to ease the problems of the developing world so that people there can work out their own solutions. It is important to remember that the Third World is itself responsible for eighty percent of the money spent on development. The total amount of development assistance for the whole world is no more than the amount Canada spends every year on health and education. If the grand total of development assistance were used to pay off the Third World debt this would still only be liquidated in the year 2004. We should not overrate, therefore, the effect of our aid programmes.

In March 1988 the Canadian government announced a new development policy which would place the greatest emphasis on the needs of the poorest countries. Thus, in the next five years forty-five percent of Canadian aid will go to Africa, thirty-nine percent to Asia and sixteen percent to Latin America. Moreover this aid will be designed to help the poorest in these countries. Canada also plans to take some action on the debt.

As far as debt is concerned, Mr. Lindores told the conference that Canada is trying to find a long term solution which would be constructive and would involve international cooperation: Canada has already taken some initiatives unilaterally. For example, since January 1986 the financial aid programmes have been changed so that loans become gifts; in effect the unused portions of loans already made were transformed into gifts. In 1987 Canada expunged the debt owed to it by the thirteen poorest countries. According to Mr. Lindores, since 1986 Canada has made serious efforts not to push the poorest countries even further into debt: other measures are planned for the near future. However, the Canadian government does not think it would be wise to wipe out the debt entirely, as that might weaken the credibility of the international financial system. Since most developing countries will probably be able to repay some of their debt sooner or later, Canada is trying to work out appropriate and flexible solutions to the problem, to enable the debtors to gain time until they are in a position to meet their obligations.

Finally, Mr. Lindores said that Canada stands out because of the importance it attaches to developing human resources in the fight against poverty in the Third World. It has taken a lead in emphasizing the role of women in development, indeed CIDA insists that women be involved in managing any projects it sponsors and that they receive an equal share of the benefits.

Canada is gradually moving in the right direction with respect to the environment in the Third World. In 1983 CIDA created a division to deal with the environment and since 1987 all projects which receive funds from CIDA must be looked at with the ecology in mind. Information and training programmes have been set up to help Third World governments cope with environmental concerns and the creation of a Canadian centre for the study of sustainable development has been announced. David Lindores agreed with Jim MacNeill, however, that Canada should first deal with its own pollution

problems before presuming to preach to the poorer countries. He ended his speech by quoting from the Brandt Report:

> History has taught us that wars produce hunger, but we are less aware that mass poverty can lead to war or end in chaos. While hunger rules, peace cannot prevail. He who wants to ban war must also ban poverty. Morally it makes no difference whether a human being is killed in war or is condemned to starve to death because of the indifference of others.

During the subsequent discussion Mr. Lindores answered many questions from the floor. He denied that the sale to Thailand of a $4.5 million machine to irradiate food was in conflict with CIDA's environmental policy. Both the World Health Organization (WHO) and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) approve of this process and Canada imposes strict security regulations when selling radiological equipment. The speaker mentioned that conservation of energy is not a key consideration in Canadian aid policy, although Western countries consume by far the largest amount of the world's supply of energy and they are the ones who should be most concerned with this issue.

The problem of deforestation, he believed, will be solved once rural electrification enables people to meet their energy requirements without using wood. However, the choice of an alternative source of energy is far from easy: fossil fuels pollute the atmosphere while nuclear power and hydro electricity have other disadvantages. CIDA has stopped supporting projects for solar energy because it is very expensive and the technology unreliable. On the other hand, biomass energy seems promising.

Family planning services will only succeed once there is a higher standard of living in the developing world. In the meantime Canada is doing the best it can to help limit population growth by taking part in the UN programmes and by collaborating with those countries seeking help with their birth control programmes. Canada also supports the work of various non-governmental organizations (NGOs) which do most of the work in this domain. One participant suggested that CIDA should insist that the physically handicapped be involved in its projects, just as it requires the participation of women. Mr. Lindores took note of this idea.

In conclusion, he dealt with the delicate question of the extent to which Canada benefits from its own development assistance programme. He said that Canada has had a requirement that recipients of aid buy Canadian goods and services. This is known as

tied aid. Aid programmes have been changed in recent years, however, in fact the sixty-five percent of Canadian which is channelled through intergovernmental organizations and NGOs is not tied at all. The remaining thirty-five percent devoted to bilateral aid programmes is tied only eight times out of ten. As part of the attempt to improve the delivery of aid to the poorest countries, tied aid has been reduced to fifty percent as far as Africa is concerned.

III DIPLOMATIC AND MILITARY SECURITY

1. Prospects for Nuclear Disarmament

Harriet Critchley, in introducing the subject of nuclear disarmament, began by noting that peace was "breaking out all over" in 1988 with the agreement on intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF), the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, the end of the conflict between Iran and Iraq, and the likelihood of settlements in Namibia and Kampuchea. The United Nations also seems to be much more effective in promoting international peace and security than has been the case for many years. However, one should not forget that the members of the United Nations failed to agree on the text of a final communiqué at the conclusion of the Third Special Session on Disarmament (UNSSOD III) which took place in the summer of 1988. At the first special session, in 1978, it had been agreed that the ultimate objective was to achieve gradual and complete disarmament, and the communiqué of the Second Session in 1982 had echoed many of the same sentiments. Harriet Critchley wondered, therefore, what priority governments are actually giving to disarmament despite the apparent revival of detente.

Richard Ned Lebow did not attempt to answer the question which had been put by Harriet Critchley, rather he stated that we have reached a critical turning point in world affairs and that the next few years will show whether or not UN objectives can be achieved.

Professor Lebow began his speech on a note of optimism by saying that only five years before he would have said that there was no hope of achieving nuclear disarmament. However, three recent developments have lead led him to take a more favourable view of the international situation. The summit meeting at Reykjavik was an extraordinary occasion. While he was there, Gorbachev proposed to dismantle the Euromissiles, to include agreements on other short-range weapons including those of other nuclear powers, and to achieve complete nuclear disarmament by the year 2000. The most important outcome of the Reykjavik meeting was the preliminary work which prepared the way for an agreement on intermediate-range nuclear weapons (INF). This was the first time the Superpowers agreed to dismantle nuclear weapons. Even more significant was the fact that this was the first occasion on which there was a serious discussion of the possibility of achieving complete nuclear disarmament. The elimination

of nuclear weapons has suddenly become a realistic and legitimate foreign policy objective for the Superpowers.

As a result of the INF agreement the United States and the Soviet Union are to destroy 3,457 missiles, including SS20s, Pershing II and cruise missiles. This will contribute greatly to strategic stability since it will eliminate the weapons which the Soviets have always believed to be the most menacing, since they placed Moscow and other Soviet command centres at the mercy of a surprise attach--a warning would be received only six minutes in advance of an attack. But the most important aspect of the INF Treaty is that it offers hope for further agreements on disarmament. Indeed it creates a two-fold precedent: it persuaded the US public that disarmament is a legitimate objective, and it confirmed, for the first time since 1946, that the Soviet Union would agree to on-site inspections.

Professor Lebow suggested that the resumption of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (START) negotiations is also a reason for optimism. It is possible that an agreement might be signed in 1989 which would reduce the arsenal of the two Superpowers to 1,600 launchers and 6,000 nuclear warheads; each side would only retain 154 of its land based "heavy" missiles. Mr. Lebow is of course well aware of the problems relating to cruise missiles and mobile launchers, as well as the difficulty caused by the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI). Nonetheless he believed an agreement might be reached, provided the United States were ready to make concessions on their "Star Wars" proposal.

The speaker gave a brief account of the reasons for these amazing developments as he saw them, the hard line which President Reagan had adopted in the early eighties had not been a determining factor--and it was only after Gorbachev came to power that the Soviet Union began to show a serious interest in negotiating. Europe's insistence on the two-track decision of 1979 which had linked the deployment of the Euro-missiles to disarmament was a decisive factor in this process, as was the effect of public opinion in Europe.

Despite all this, Professor Lebow believed that certain aspects of the current situation still gave rise to pessimism. He noted that the leaders of both major political parties in the United States had expressed skepticism about disarmament in the course of

the presidential campaign. On the basis of this, it seems unlikely that the next US government would be deeply committed to peace. Secondly, there is a very influential, multinational arms lobby in the West which is opposed to arms reduction. At the time he spoke, this alliance between a US elite and the European conservatives seemed much more influential than any possible combination of peace activists, either American or European, with the European Left. Thirdly, the Strategic Defense Initiative continues to be a serious problem. It is clear that no agreement can be reached on strategic weapons as long as Washington remains committed to pursuing this project. By establishing a defence in space the United States might acquire a first strike capability since "Star Wars" would protect it from reprisals on the part of the Soviet Union, in these circumstances the Soviet Union would have no alternative but to strengthen its own second strike capacity by increasing its number of missiles. There could be no question therefore of the Soviet Union reducing its strategic forces if the SDI led to a defence being established in space.

Professor Lebow described two possible scenarios for disarmament. The optimistic scenario foresees further significant reductions in nuclear weapons and assumes that US-Soviet relations will continue to improve, that the public both in Europe and the United States will continue to accept and support the disarmament process, and that Gorbachev will remain in power and continue to devote his energies to improving the country's economy at the expense of its defence budget. The proposed change on the part of the Soviet Union which involves replacing its traditional military "defensive-offensive" attitude to Europe by one which is "defensive-defensive" would contribute to a greater sense of security in Europe and would facilitate a reduction in the nuclear arsenals.

The pessimistic scenario, on the other hand, foresees the disarmament process as reaching a deadlock. The most likely cause for this would be the fall of Gorbachev, something which might well happen if he fails to meet his people's economic expectations. The end of perestroika would reinforce the position of the Hawks in the West and lead Mr. Bush to fall back on a position of intransigence and to support SDI. This would mean a third period of cold war.

Professor Lebow thought that what will really happen will probably fall somewhere between these two extremes. He refused to commit himself to any more precise prediction and was wary of attempts at forecasting the future because it never follows from

the past in exactly the way one might expect. Many things could still happen between now and the end of the century.

During the question period he touched on many subjects. He thought it highly unlikely that the two superpowers treated global problems and the fate of the Third World as being an integral part of security, or that they would agree to letting the United Nations play a greater role in the disarmament process. He also thought it unlikely, much as he regretted this, that economic problems in the United States would persuade Washington of the need to disarm because unfortunately it was impossible for the president to withstand the pressure exerted by the Pentagon.

Professor Lebow maintained that the Soviet leaders are adamantly opposed to "Star Wars" because they want to reduce their expenditure on defence, in order to provide the resources required to modernize their economy. There is also opposition to SDI in the United States, even among the military, some of whom fear that it would take too great a share of future defence budgets. SDI has changed somewhat since it was first proposed, originally it was envisaged as a grand defence strategy which would offer the whole of North America complete protection. Now it is seen more as a means of defending military installations. Nonetheless even this revised version continues to be totally unacceptable to the Soviets. The Americans, therefore, will determine the fate of disarmament by whatever decisions they came to on SDI.

Mr. Lebow did not wish to comment on issues in Canadian foreign policy such as the proposal to buy nuclear-powered submarines or Canada's continued participation in NATO. He pointed out, however, that Canada should bear in mind that one probable consequence of its withdrawal from NATO would be an increased sense of insecurity on the part of its allies, particularly the Europeans.

The speaker recognized the effect of the peace movement on government policy, particularly in Europe. In the United States, however, peace movements do not have the same kind of influence as did those movements in the sixties which struggled for human rights and against the war in Vietnam.

Professor Lebow concluded by criticizing certain substitution policies which put forward the idea that one kind of defence might be replaced by another. The proponents of these theories are naive in failing to understand that the type of defence one uses is a product of the political environment. Furthermore, relations between the superpowers must improve before "passive" or "non-provocative" defence can be considered.

2. Control of Regional Conflict

Liisa North introduced this subject and dealt with the ecological issues which had been discussed by Loxley, McLaren, MacNeill and Fournier. She gave her own interpretation of these problems by placing them in the context of a specific regional conflict, that of Central America. The deterioration of the environment, which has been responsible for so many of the problems in that area, is, in Professor North's opinion, largely due to the unequal balance of power. The region is not overpopulated, its difficulties mainly spring from the fact that most of the arable land belongs to a small number of large scale landowners. Priority is given to producing goods for export and this has lead to deforestation and the exhaustion and erosion of the soil. Both war and US military intervention have had serious effects on the area's ecology; for example, in 1986 forest fires destroyed 140,000 pine trees, along with a reforestation project which had been started six years before. The rate of deforestation in Honduras has doubled in the course of the last few years. This was due to military manoeuvres, the guerrilla war waged by the Contras and the influx of refugees. The money which Canada has spent on reforestation projects has largely been wasted. According to Professor North, Canada would make a greater contribution to solving the underlying political problems in the area by actively contributing to the peace process in Central America.

Jean-Pierre Derriennic approached the problem of regional conflict quite differently. He suggested that regional conflicts are more and more frequently the result of decisions taken locally and therefore it is increasingly difficult for those outside the area to exert a restraining influence. No doubt the international situation does continue to impinge on these conflicts either because the risks of escalation lead the great powers to intervene, or because the local players' dependence on outsiders for access to essential resources, such as armaments, makes them subject to manipulation. Sometimes regional conflicts are

linked in a symbolic way to far wider disputes, but no external intervention could ensure peace.

Professor Derriennic used the Arab-Israeli and the Iran-Iraq conflicts to illustrate the difficulties which the great powers encounter when they try to intervene. He also tried to show that any attempts by outsiders to limit such disputes often succeed only in prolonging them.

The conflict in the Middle East did not originate in East-West rivalry and it remained a separate issue, though it did affect East-West relations, particularly in 1967 and 1973. Intervention by the great powers, through the medium of the Security Council, did not greatly influence the course of the war of 1967, which had ended when Israel rapidly achieved its objective; it failed to put an end to the War of Attrition in 1970, which ceased only when the Soviet Union's alliance with Egypt had enabled the latter to regroup its forces. The UN resolution probably helped put an end to hostilities in 1973 largely because Israel did not want to crush Egypt entirely, but wanted to preserve the option of negotiating a final peace settlement. While US intervention did help Israel and Egypt conclude the peace treaty in 1977, in the final analysis it was Egypt's change of policy which made this possible. The extent of the United States' influence on Israel has often been exaggerated. The Americans can not risk putting too much pressure on Israel in case the latter retreats into an aggressive isolationism, backed by the threat of using nuclear weapons. It is true, nonetheless, that the United States could have tried to prevent Israel from invading Lebanon in January 1982 and from establishing the Jewish colonies in the occupied territories.

To Professor Derriennic the Gulf War was a completely different case. Both protagonists were non-aligned countries and were less dependent on the great powers, partly because the arms they used were much less sophisticated than those in the Middle East and partly because they were better endowed with certain resources, especially oil.

The countries supplying Iraq with goods did nothing to prevent the initial attack--which could have been foreseen as early as May 1980--simply because they were never consulted, and even if they had attempted to intervene, President Hussein would still have pushed ahead, since his plan was to achieve victory so rapidly that an embargo would not have time to take effect. Once the war in the Gulf got started it was hard

to stop, for any large scale embargo would have helped Iran, which was at an advantage because of its economy and its larger population, yet no one wished to see Iran win. The war ended only once Iran was exhausted because of an arms embargo, the 1985 fall in the price of oil, the difficulties of obtaining international financing and the intervention of the United States. From the summer of 1987 the latter prevented Iran from responding to Iraqi air attacks in the Gulf.

Professor Derriennic proceeded to consider the symbolic aspects of these conflicts. The Israeli-Arab conflict assumed considerable symbolic significance for the great powers, but this was not true of the War in the Gulf. On the whole he thought it preferable that a regional conflict have a certain symbolic significance at the international level. This permits a better understanding of the motives of those who try to intervene and it leads to a certain amount of stability and moderation despite the fact that the positions adopted by the regional powers risk becoming as rigid as those of their supporters. If a regional conflict has no international significance this often leads to cynicism and indifference, attitudes which were only too evident in the War in the Gulf, in which instance governments sold arms secretly to both belligerents. However, it is sometimes easier to resolve a conflict which has no external implications. In the case of the Iran-Iraq war this enabled people to shelve the question of which country was to blame for starting the conflict, and to devote their energies to bringing it to an end.

Professor Derriennic concluded, therefore, that there is no miracle solution either for preventing regional conflict altogether or for bringing it to an end. Local actors play too important a role in these regional conflicts for attempts at mediation to be successful. In developing a foreign policy each case should be judged on its merits. One should opt for prevention or mediation, whenever possible, by injecting just as much symbolic content as necessary to sustain these attempts at mediation and to reduce hostility, but not so much as to encourage the adversaries to adopt even more rigid positions making the conflict harder to resolve. Outside powers have to accept the fact that they cannot always control regional situations and that their attempts at mediation will not necessarily produce any immediate results.

3. Workshop on Conflict and Arms

Kal Holsti began by asking his audience to think about what the international situation might be like in the year 2000 and then to define the options which might be open to Canada as far as peace and security were concerned.

The participants agreed that security problems in the Third World will probably increase as continuing regional rivalries are made worse by under-development, over-population and the degradation of the environment. It is unlikely, according to Professor Holsti, that any money will be diverted from military purposes to economic development because in the Third World armies do more than just fight wars: they help to intimidate potential opposition, they act as police, they preserve the country's status and its international prestige, they are an instrument of social mobility and they maintain the pomp and ceremony surrounding the head of state, to give just a few examples. In other words they provide a sort of insurance policy for the regime.

On the other hand, there is reason to be much more optimistic about US-Soviet relations. Professor Holsti believes that the changes in Soviet policy in recent years have been so great, that even if Gorbachev were overthrown, his successor would not be able to turn back the clock, but would have to continue to give priority to economic recovery and detente.

Participants asked questions about what policy Canada might best pursue in the current circumstances. It was agreed that very little has changed in Canadian policy over the last twenty-five years, priority is still given to Europe and to NATO, as was shown in the 1987 White Paper on Defence. The proposal to acquire nuclear-powered submarines did not represent a switch to a defence policy geared to purely national interests--the White Paper saw this force as fulfilling Canada's support role in the North Atlantic, rather than as means of transferring attention to the Arctic and the North Pacific.

Not surprisingly several speakers were opposed to the submarine proposal and also criticized Canada's continued participation in NATO. They agreed with the well known writer, Gwynne Dyer, that the policy which this represented is outdated and dangerous.

Canada should restrict its defence activities to safeguarding its own territory (including the North) and to participating in UN peacekeeping activities. Certain participants went even further in supporting internationalism and proposed, for example, that Canada should cede its territory in the Arctic and place it under UN control.

Many speakers disagreed with these ideas, however, and defended continued participation in NATO, on the grounds that Canada has political and moral obligations to its allies in Europe. It was also pointed out that adherence to NATO is much cheaper than neutrality. Professor Derriennic put forward an unusual argument in support of NATO. He suggested that the Alliance helps to keep the peace in Europe (between Greece and Turkey for example) and that Canada plays an important part in NATO as a mediator. Professor Holsti suggested that it is probably the European Economic Community (EEC) which really acts as a peacekeeper in Europe and he also wondered whether there is any serious likelihood of a war between two liberal democracies, since this has never happened. Professor Derriennic said that he was concerned with conflict rather than outright war, and he pointed out that the EEC did not deal with military problems. If NATO ceased to exist this would lead to either the political unification of Europe or of Germany. Neither outcome would be desirable since it would lead to the creation of a new centre of international power--whether in Europe or in Germany--which would create all sorts of problems for strategic policy and disarmament. German reunification would revive various ancient feuds in Europe.

Those who were opposed to the idea of the Arctic becoming international territory maintained that this would conflict with Canada's obligations, that it would not necessarily further the cause of internationalism, and that it might well lead to conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union. The proponents of a moderate approach to foreign policy accused their critics of being unable to agree on a coherent policy to replace current objectives. Those supporting neutralism retorted that the objections they raised had never received any serious consideration by either public servants or politicians.

4. War and Peace: Canadian Responses

Ron Fisher referred to the creation of the Institute by quoting the well known saying that it was better to light a candle than curse the dark. While he agreed with

Professor Lebow, that we have reached a critical moment in history and that there is now a chance of making progress in nuclear disarmament and reducing tension between the superpowers, he nonetheless remains pessimistic. It will not be easy to resolve the various national conflicts which are such a threat to both regional and global security. To change a world geared for war, into one where peace is the only priority, was, in his opinion, like trying to turn an oil tanker around. In other words, an undertaking requiring skill, time, and patience.

In his speech on Canada and world security, Geoffrey Pearson tried to single out the key foreign policy issues on which Canadians either agree or disagree. He made some suggestions as to how one might develop a policy for achieving real peace and security, which would attract the support of the majority and yet be based on a realistic assessment of what is genuinely possible, given the current international situation.

Mr. Pearson began by describing what has been the traditional view of Canada's security interests and which could be summed up as Canada being an ally of the United States, just as it once was "Canada at Britain's side." Since Canada is not subject to any direct threat, largely because of its geographical position, its idea of security is different from that of its main allies. According to this traditional view, the North Atlantic Alliance is necessary for Canadian security because it ensures that the United States would use its forces to protect both Canada and its allies in Europe without totally dominating its partners. For its part, Canada has an obligation to maintain forces in Europe and to abide by NATO decisions concerning strategy and arms control; Canada should also support NORAD and participate in peacekeeping activities.

A second school of thought, as described by Mr. Pearson, wants Canadian defence policy to be what he described as "NATO plus." Its supporters believe that Canada should continue to play an active role in the Alliance but should also place more emphasis on defending its own national sovereignty, particularly against the new threat arising from cruise missiles based on submarines or planes deployed in the Arctic. This point of view supposes a more important role for the navy which would have to protect a coastline longer than even that of the Soviet Union. This policy of "NATO plus" is the one adopted by the Conservative government.

A third approach could be described as "Canada first." According to this Canada should concentrate on defending its own territory and should withdraw from NATO and use its forces at home, particularly in the North where the principal threat to our sovereignty comes not from the Soviet Union, but from the United States, since it is the latter which is contesting Canadian sovereignty in the area. According to this approach, the government should push for distinctive Canadian policies on arms control rather than echoing those of NATO, and should give greater emphasis to peacekeeping activities. This view is supported by the New Democratic Party (NDP).

All three positions have certain features in common. First of all, nobody is suggesting unilateral disarmament for Canada. On the contrary, all three propose to maintain defence spending at its current level if not to increase it. It is also agreed that Canada must play some part in the defence of North America, either through NORAD or in some other way. Finally, everyone accepts Canada's continued participation in UN peacekeeping forces.

Mr. Pearson then spoke of three key issues, which concern the public, but about which Canadians do not agree. First, there is no agreement on how to deal with what is probably the greatest threat of all to Canadian security, nuclear war. Many believe that the only solution to this is to support the NATO policy of deterrence. Others, while accepting that view, think it would be better if Canadian forces were used less for active deterrence and undertook more passive but equally important activities such as surveillance and warning of attack. Many who see nuclear war as a threat, think it is more likely to come about through the escalation of a Third World conflict, than because of any surprise attack in Europe by the Soviet Union. In this case, Canada would be well advised to give priority to mediating in regional conflicts, preventing the proliferation of nuclear and chemical weapons and taking part in UN peacekeeping activities. Mr. Pearson maintained, however, that such a policy would not justify abandoning our commitments to the defence of Europe, since Canadian leaders must always provide for the worst case scenario, which would be war in Europe.

The second key issue where there is disagreement among Canadians, is the extent to which sovereignty should be a factor in security planning. It is essential to decide whether the Soviet Union is still believed to be the greatest threat to Canadian

sovereignty, for the answer to this question would determine whether Canada could take primary responsibility for its own defence outside the framework of NORAD.

A third question on which there is disagreement is whether Canada should continue to support NATO policies on security issues and arms control. As a result of the recent Soviet initiatives there is a divergence of opinion among the Allies. Should Canada encourage this and assert independent views, thus differentiating itself from the United States, or should it promote unity and support the official NATO position?

Mr. Pearson went on to propose a practical policy for encouraging peace and security which might meet with the approval of the majority of Canadians.

Where disarmament is concerned, Canada and its European allies are afraid that by insisting on SDI the United States could make the strategic arms negotiations impossible. If the negotiations were indeed to break down over this issue then Canada should take a firm stand in support of disarmament. Canada should also make its views known about the deployment and limitation of cruise missiles since these missiles fly over Canadian territory. Canada should take a firm stand on another issue which had been at the top of its arms control agenda for almost thirty years, that of a comprehensive nuclear test ban. The current US position is that there should be no test ban until nuclear weapons are abolished. The world is, therefore, in theory moving gradually towards a test ban, but without achieving any significant results. Yet a comprehensive ban would be one of the main ways of attaining the universal objective of non-proliferation.

Canada will have to devote considerable resources to improving its defence of the Arctic, in collaboration with the United States or alone. In order to do this it would have to choose between two options, neither of which would be popular: to give up some of its NATO obligations or to increase the defence budget. Mr. Pearson thought that the Government would be well advised to await the outcome of the proposed force-reduction negotiations, before deciding either to reduce the Canadian contingent in Europe or to buy any expensive new equipment. He also thought that Canada should take the Northwest Passage dispute to the World Court of Justice in order to clarify Canada's territorial rights in the Arctic. Finally, it would be a good idea for it to explore with its allies joint measures for defence and arms control in the Arctic area,

including the means of verifying submarine movements. In the meantime it should hold back on its purchase of nuclear-powered submarines.

Regional security questions are also of interest to Canada, where Canada could play a helpful role from its seat on the Security Council. There is now a good prospect of reaching an accord in Namibia. Canada should continue to support this process and be willing to contribute peacekeeping forces if necessary. There is no sign, however, a solution in the Middle East is any closer at hand. Canada might be tempted to use its position as a member of the UN peacekeeping force to avoid taking a stand on this issue, but Mr. Pearson hoped it would resist this temptation. If the negotiations in the Middle East were unsuccessful, Canada should take the initiative in organizing a contact group within the Security Council to promote a rapprochement between the opposing parties. The main hope for peace in Central America was the Arias Peace Plan. If that failed, as it might well, Nicaragua would probably take its case to the Security Council, and Canada should then contribute to attempts at mediation. Whatever happens, Canada will have to make up its mind whether to abide by the principle of non-intervention in US policy or to condemn American intransigence in the area.

Mr. Pearson ended his remarks with a discussion of "comprehensive security." Throughout its deliberations the conference emphasized the links between the political, military, economic and ecological aspects of security. To achieve a security which would encompass all this we need a strong United Nations Organization. Yet no reforms have been made to the UN in recent years: it has experienced considerable difficulties and has had to curtail its operations ever since the United States began to reduce or delay its financial contributions. Now, the time is ripe for reform because of the positive attitude of the Soviet Union. It might be possible to create a permanent peacekeeping force. Perhaps the Security Council could be enlarged to twenty seats and informal discussions might be arranged among its members. The United Nations could make a greater effort to protect the environment. In seeking to promote world-wide security, one of the first diplomatic tasks which the Canadian government might undertake is to make use of its special relationship with the United States to persuade the latter to take a more positive approach to the UN.

Mr. Pearson recalled the words of St. Augustin: "peace is a well disposed order of all things." This definition, which implies not only order but also justice, sums up the aims of all those who see security as an objective with many facets.

* * * * * * * *

In closing the Conference Mr. Pearson maintained that the current period is marked by a decrease in tension between East and West but an increase in the number of new problems which affect security. Because of this, governments must change their priorities concerning peace and security and develop new policies to deal with development, overpopulation, the environment, and regional conflict. Public opinion has an important part to play in bringing about any such change; bearing this in mind, the work of the Institute both at the local level and in its attempts to educate the public remains essential to encourage a greater awareness of world problems.

IV PARTICIPANTS AND SPEAKERS

ANDERSON, Phyllis, United Nations Association in Canada, Winnipeg

ANDERSON, Stuart, United Nations Association in Canada, Winnipeg

BARTON, William, CIIPS, Ottawa

BASTIEN, Denis, Sogestran Inc., Ottawa

BIETZ, Ron, Mennonite Central Committee, Winnipeg

BILD, Eva, CIIPS, Ottawa

BILD, Fred, Department of External Affairs, Ottawa,

BRAIDE, David I.W., Niagara Institute, Niagara-on-the-Lake

BRONSTONE, Adam, Winnipeg,

BRYANS, Michael, CIIPS, Ottawa

CATANA, Maria, CIIPS, Ottawa

CATT, Rheo, Winnipeg

CLARK, Stuart, Winnipeg

CLAYTON, M.J., Winnipeg

COLPITTS, Marjorie, Winnipeg

CONNELL, Susan, CIIPS, Ottawa

CRITCHLEY, W. Harriet, University of Calgary, Calgary

DAFOE, John, Winnipeg Free Press, Winnipeg

DAY, Edith, Winnipeg

DERRIENNIC, Jean-Pierre, Laval University, Québec

DUNG, Vu Viet, Mennonite Central Committee, Winnipeg

EMBERLEY, Kenneth, United Nations Association in Canada, Winnipeg

EPP, George K., Mennonite Studies Centre, Winnipeg

FELDSCHMID, Jurgen W., Winnipeg

FERGUSSON, James, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg

FERNANDES, Moses, Winnipeg

FISHER, Ron, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon

FLOOD, Audrey, University of Winnipeg, Winnipeg

FOURNIER, Francine, Canadian Commission for UNESCO, Ottawa

GILMOR, Ingrid, Winnipeg

GRIERSON, I.M., Winnipeg

GROSS, Zack, The Marquis Project, Brandon

GUEST, Hessie J., United Nations Association in Canada, Winnipeg

HAMLIN, Doug, CIIPS, Ottawa

HAMPSON, Fen, CIIPS, Ottawa

HANKS, G.A. (Mrs.), Winnipeg

HANKS, G.A., Winnipeg

HARNDEN, Terry R., Winnipeg

HEDGE, Scott, Winnipeg

HOLSTI, Kal, University of British Columbia Vancouver

HOMONYLO, Christina, Ottawa

HUTCHEON, Terry, Grant Park High School, Winnipeg

JANZEN, Helen, United Nations Association in Canada, Winnipeg

JENNINGS, Debra, The Marquis Project, Brandon

JUNGBAUER, Roy, Winnipeg

KHAN, Marilee, YM-YWCA of Winnipeg, Winnipeg

KHAN, Rais A., University of Winnipeg, Winnipeg

KLASSEN, Aggie, Winnipeg

KLASSEN, Menno, Winnipeg

KLASSEN, Val, Winnipeg Coordinating Committee for Disarmament, Winnipeg

KLASSEN, William, University of Toronto, Toronto

KORYTOWSKI, Andrea, Kelvin High School, Winnipeg

KURTZ, Willy, World Federalists of Canada, Winnipeg

LALONDE-MORISSET, Marie-Andrée, CIIPS, Ottawa

LANCUCMA, Paul, Winnipeg,

LAUNDY, Katherine, CIIPS, Ottawa

LEBOW, Richard Ned, Cornell University, Ithaca

LENZMANN, Ed, Grant Park High School, Winnipeg

LEWIS, Stephen, former Canadian Ambassador to the United Nations

LINDORES, Douglas, Canadian International Development Agency, Hull

LINDSEY-WIESER, Anne, Winnipeg Coordinating Committee for Disarmament, Concerned Citizens of Manitoba Inc., Winnipeg

LONGMAN, Delza, World Federalists of Canada, Winnipeg

LOXLEY, John, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg

MACDONELL, G.T., United Nations Association in Canada, Winnipeg

MACDONELL, G.T. (Mrs.), United Nations Association in Canada, Winnipeg

MACLEOD, E. Malcolm (Colonel), Department of National Defence, Ottawa,

MALCOLMSON, Robert, Queen's University, Kingston

MARTEINSON, John, Canadian Defence Quarterly, Toronto

MATSUO, H., Winnipeg

MCKAY, Sue, United Nations Association in Canada, Winnipeg

MCLAREN, Digby, Royal Society of Canada, Ottawa

MCNEILL, Jim, Institute for Research on Public Policy, Ottawa

MYCHAJLYSZYN, Natalie, Winnipeg

NAIDU, M.V., Canadian Peace Research and Education Association, Brandon

NORRIE, Helen, United Nations Association in Canada, Winnipeg

NORTH, Liisa, York University, Toronto

O'DWYER, Gary, St. Mary's Secondary School, Cobourg

O'DWYER, Pauline, St. Mary's Secondary School, Cobourg

PEARSON, Geoffrey, CIIPS, Ottawa

PENNER, Leona, Mennonite Central Committee, Winnipeg

PENNER, Peter, Winnipeg

PETERS, Bert, Canadian Mennonite Bible College, Winnipeg

PETERS, Greti, Mennonite Central Committee, Winnipeg

PROCTER, Clint, University of Winnipeg, Winnipeg

QAMAR, Ijaz, Ahmadiyya Muslim Association, Winnipeg

REED, Valerie, Winnipeg

REIMER, D.H., Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, Winnipeg,

RICHARDSON, Boyce, Ottawa

RIOUX, Jean-François, Carleton University, Ottawa

ROBERTSON, Henry, Winnipeg

ROBERTSON, Margaret J., Winnipeg

ROBINSON, Colin S., Winnipeg

ROUS, Melba M., Catholic Women's League, Canadian Catholic Organization for Development and Peace, Winnipeg

SCHNEIDER, Hans, Selkirk

SCHNEIDER, Hans (Mrs.), Selkirk,

SCHREYER, Edward (The Right Honourable), Winnipeg

SHENKAROW, Lori, Winnipeg

STEWART, D.B., United Nations Association in Canada, Killarney

STEWART, D.B. (Mrs.), United Nations Association in Canada, Killarney

STINSON, John, Manitoba Association for Rights and Liberties, Winnipeg,

STUART, Mary, YM-YWCA of Winnipeg, Winnipeg

TAYLOR, Chris, National Defence College, Kingston

VAILLANCOURT, Jean-Guy, University of Montréal, Montréal

VEAKES, Grant (M.), Winnipeg

VEATCH, Richard, University of Winnipeg, Winnipeg

WATTS, Beverley, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg

WYLIE, H.G., Winnipeg